



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
ELLCOTT CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

VOICE 410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-3042

June Minutes

Thursday, June 6, 2019; 7:00 p.m.

The June meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, June 6, 2019 in the C. Vernon Gray room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043. Ms. Holmes informed the Commission that she made a few technical corrections to case HPC-19-21 8472 Hill Street, adding in a few areas of missing testimony regarding damage to the wall that was removed and to the knee walls and stoop sinking and being removed. Ms. Holmes reviewed each of the changes with the Commission at the end of the meeting, prior to approval of the minutes. Mr. Roth moved to approve the May minutes. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Members present: Allan Shad, Chair; Eileen Tennor, Vice-Chair; Drew Roth, Secretary; Bruno Reich; Erica Zoren

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Dan Bennett, Lewis Taylor, Kaitlyn Clifford

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

Consent Agenda

1. MA-18-40c – 12050 Old Frederick Road, Marriottsville

Regular Agenda

2. HPC-19-26 – 6042 Old Washington Road, ElkrIDGE, HO-803
3. HPC-19-27 – 8081 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-360
4. HPC-19-28 – 8085-8089 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. HPC-19-29 – 8293 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. HPC-19-30 – 8141 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. HPC-19-31 – 3877 College Avenue, Ellicott City
8. HPC-19-32 – 8289 Main Street, Ellicott City
9. HPC-19-33 – 8249 Main Street, Ellicott City
10. HPC-19-34 – Sidewalks, curbs and gutter in the vicinity of 8267 Main Street to 8411 Main Street to 3880 Ellicott Mills Drive

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Design Guideline Work Session
2. Administrative Session

CONSENT AGENDA

MA-18-40c – 12050 Old Frederick Road, Marriottsville

Final tax credit claim 20.112

Applicant: Sally Hebner

Request: The applicant, Sally Hebner, requests final tax credit approval for work that was performed in case MA-18-40c at 12050 Old Frederick Road, Marriottsville.

Background and Site Description: This property is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-1149; it is not located in a local historic district. The applicant was pre-approved through the Executive Secretary process in September 2018 to replace windows.

Scope of Work: The applicant seeks final tax credit approval. The applicant submitted documentation that \$25,925.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work and seeks \$6,481.24 in final tax credits. The work complies with that pre-approved and the cancelled checks and other documentation total the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the final tax credit as submitted, in the amount of \$6,481.24.

Testimony: Mr. Shad asked if anyone in the audience wished to present testimony. There was no one in the audience who wanted to testify.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to approve. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

HPC-19-26 – 6042 Old Washington Road, Elkrige, HO-803

Advisory Comments for site development plan with demolition.

Applicant: Elyse Gibson

Request: The applicant, Elyse Gibson, requests Advisory Comments on the demolition of the historic house and new construction to be located at 6042 Old Washington Road, Elkrige.

Background and Site Description: This property is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-803, the Old Washington Road Survey District. This property is not located in a local historic district.

The Inventory form explains that “the Old Washington Road Survey District is significant under Criteria A and C for its association with broad patterns in American history and its vernacular architecture ranging in date from 1850 to 1953. This district is located immediately to the west of the historic settlement of Elkrige Landing and their histories are intimately connected. This district derives its primary significance from its role as a commuter suburb related first to the railroad and later to the automobile. It also contains a good collection of vernacular architecture, mostly domestic, exhibiting the stylistic trends of 100 years of building.”

The Inventory form lists the subject property at 6042 Old Washington Road under the category of "Altered Historic Buildings Which Cannot Be Dated" and explains that "these buildings have been altered to such a degree that no date can accurately be assigned to them, but some piece of evidence (a stone foundation, for instance) indicates that the building does have a historic core."

The County Architectural Historian documented the house and provided the following additional information:

The house at 6042 Old Washington Road was probably built circa 1900-1920 as a small, single family dwelling. A rear ell was added shortly after construction. At an unknown date, but possibly as early as the Depression, the house was converted to two apartments (one on each floor) by removing the interior staircase and putting an addition on the northeast side, which contains the new stairway to the second-story apartment. Over the ensuing 80 years much of the original fabric has been removed from the building, leaving only some door trim and an original door or two. A large, unsympathetic two-story addition has been placed on the front, with large openings cut through the original front wall for access into this addition. A side porch has been enclosed, and the building has not been maintained, resulting in water damage, rot, and mold inside both floors. As a result, the building retains very little historic integrity, even to its period of conversion into apartments.

The application explains that the house has been vacant for many months and neglected for years. Additionally, there have been many alterations over the years and the house no longer retains any historic value, as indicated by the County Architectural Historian.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to demolish the existing historic house and construct a new single-family home on the property. The new house will be located in the middle of the property, farther away from the property lines than the existing single-family house. The application indicates that the applicant has begun making inquiries to salvage building materials.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations: The review criteria in Section 16.118 of the subdivision regulations do not apply in this scenario because the house is proposed to be demolished and no longer retains any historic value. The County Architectural Historian has already documented the house.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff has no further recommendations.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Elyse Gibson and Eileen Clegg. Mr. Shad asked if the Applicants had any comments regarding the staff report. Ms. Gibson stated she had nothing to add and that the staff report was accurate.

Mr. Roth stated he was unable to find the location of the property when he drove out for a site visit. Ms. Gibson said others have had the same issue with locating the property. She explained that the property is located behind another 2-acre property and access is only available from an easement driveway and is hard to access right now. Mr. Roth confirmed that if he drove down Washington Road, is the house is not visible from the road. Ms. Gibson said that it was not visible and explained the siting of the house.

Mr. Reich explained that normally the Commission discourages Applicants from demolishing historical homes, but as this particular property has been modified so many times and has been documented by the County's Historian, he has no problem with the application. Ms. Gibson stated that she is considering deconstructing the house to salvage materials and donate materials if possible. Mr. Reich stated the County has all the history on the house and thanked the Applicants for their cooperation. Mr.

Shad said it was too bad to lose another historic property, but acknowledged the house was not maintained very well and there was not much to save architecturally from a historic standpoint.

HPC-19-27 – 8081 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-360

Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations.

Applicant: Howard County Department of Public Works

Request: The applicant, the Howard County Department of Public Works, requests a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations at 8081 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District and is also listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-360, the Boone House and most recently housed the business Tea on the Tiber. The building dates circa 1833-1834. The building was damaged in the May 2018 flood.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to make the following repairs and alterations:

- 1) Remove plywood over existing front and side entrances and install new wood full light doors to match those that existed prior to the May 2018 flood. Restore 3-light wood transom on side door.
- 2) Install operable wood paneled shutters on the front first floor windows.
- 3) Remove the plywood between the doors on the rear of the building and install new wood German lap siding to match the existing. Fix the doors on the rear of the building in place.
- 4) Remove a section of aluminum fencing and wood deck boards, leaving only the beams in place.
- 5) Paint all new items to match the previously existing colors (maroon doors, dark green shutters, tan siding).
- 6) Patch and repair any damaged wood to match the existing and paint to match.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 6.G: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Entrances

- 1) *Chapter 6.G recommends, “when repair is not possible, replace historic doors and entrance features with features of the same size, style and finish.”*

The proposed full light wood door will match the previously existing door that was destroyed in the 2018 flood and complies with the Guideline recommendations.

Chapter 6.I: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Shutters and Blinds

- 2) *Chapter 6.I recommends:*
 - a. *“For replacements, install shutters or blinds that maintain the size, style and placement of the original.*
 - b. *“Install shutters or blinds of painted wood. Shutters or blinds should be correctly sized for the window and operable, or at least appear operable with hinges and hold backs (shutter dogs) appropriate to the period of initial construction.”*

The proposed wood, paneled replacement shutters will match those historically on the building and will be operable. The proposed shutters comply with the Guideline recommendations.

Chapter 6.D: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Wood Siding, Shingles and Logs

- 3) Chapter 6.D considers the following to be Routine Maintenance, "replacing deteriorated siding or shingles with materials that exactly match the existing siding or shingles and do not cover or alter details such as cornerboards, door and window trim and cornices."

The proposed siding replacement will match the existing German lap siding and is considered Routine Maintenance.

Chapter 5: Routine Maintenance

- 4) Chapter 5 states the following is Routine Maintenance, "painting previously painted surfaces using the same color."

The doors, shutters and siding will all be painted to match the previously existing colors, and is considered Routine Maintenance.

Chapter 4: The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

- 5) Standard 10 states, "New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

The deck boards to be removed and section of black aluminum fencing are new construction and not historic. They are also attached to a modern addition, and not directly attached to the historic structure. The removal of these modern features complies with Standard 10 as the historic structure will not be impacted.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Shad asked if there was anyone in the audience that was in opposition to the application that would like to testify. There was no one in the audience who wanted to testify. Mr. Shad swore in Robert Z. Hollenbeck from the Department of Public Works. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Hollenbeck had any corrections or additions to the staff report. Mr. Hollenbeck stated he had nothing to add.

Mr. Reich asked if the door that will be installed will have the current finish. Mr. Hollenbeck clarified that the door will be painted to match the doors that were previously there and will be a maroon color. Mr. Reich asked for clarity on the exposed beams. Mr. Hollenbeck explained the deck at the rear of the building is supported by a series of steel beams/wide flange sections. He said that DPW is proposing to remove the decking but leave the wide flange sections in place at this time, but said the beams will likely be removed at a later date, pending conclusion of the Section 106 process. Mr. Hollenbeck explained that the impetus behind the request to remove the decking and fix the rear doors in place was to alleviate the chance that anyone could go back or have access to the rear of the building since there will be no rear access moving forward. Mr. Reich asked how the door will be fixed in place. Mr. Hollenbeck said that the two remaining doors will be screwed in place. Ms. Zoren asked if the deck will be rebuilt or if the whole deck structure would be removed. Ms. Hollenbeck said that the structure would be removed in a separate case, pending completion of the Section 106 process.

Ms. Holmes amended the staff report to explain the shutters are missing from the building and that is why they are being reinstalled with a replacement in-kind. Mr. Hollenbeck said the windows are in good shape along the front of the building. He explained that at the rear of the building there were four doors, and said that two doors are in good enough condition to be repaired and fixed in place to make them inoperable, but look aesthetically pleasing. He explained that for the remaining opening between

the other two doors, where there were previously French doors, DPW is proposing to fill that space in with German lap wood siding to match what is on the building now and paint the siding to match.

Mr. Shad asked if the proposed work is mostly cosmetic to make the building's doors look like they are operable. Mr. Hollenbeck stated the building will be inoperable until the completion of the storm water management mitigation projects.

Ms. Holmes clarified and amended the staff report to reflect that the rear addition of the building, in which the doors are being replaced with siding, is a non-historic addition.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-19-28 – 8085-8089 Main Street, Ellicott City

Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations.

Applicant: Howard County Department of Public Works

Request: The applicant, Howard County Department of Public Works, requests a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations at 8085-8089 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1920, but was severely damaged in a November 1999 six alarm fire.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to make the following repairs and alterations:

- 1) Remove plywood over the existing entrance doors and windows.
- 2) Replace the windows to with new wood windows to match the previously existing casement and picture windows (prior to 2018 flood).
- 3) Replace door with a full light wood door, painted black, to match the previously existing.
- 4) Paint façade elements at first floor level (below cornice/trim) as needed. Paint colors to match existing.
- 5) Replace any damaged siding, masonry or trim to match the existing using in-kind materials and colors.
- 6) Remove awning and support posts.
- 7) Remove existing mosaic tile floor at entryway. A concrete floor will be installed in this location and the basement is being infilled with flowable fill and a concrete slab. A future application will include a new floor for the entryway.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Storefront Windows

Chapter 6.H: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Windows

- 1) *Chapter 6.H recommends, "when repair is not possible, replace original windows, frames and related details with features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, material, finish and window pane configuration. If possible, reproduce frame size and profile and muntin detailing."*

Chapter 6.K: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Storefronts

- 2) *Chapter 6.K recommends, "preserve the form and details of existing historic storefronts. Uncover or replace architectural detailing that has been obscured by later additions."*

Chapter 5: Routine Maintenance

- 3) *Chapter 5 states the following is Routine Maintenance, "painting previously painted surfaces using the same color."*

After the 2016 flood the previous owner was approved in November 2016 in case HPC-16-101 to make alterations to the storefront consisting of:

- Replace the framed walls below the storefront windows with concrete block. Replace framing and panels around concrete block to match the previously existing design. The walls may be raised 6 to 8 inches higher than the existing walls, depending on the coursing of the block. If the wall is raised, the size of the windows would decrease as well.
- Replace the storefront windows on the front of the building with impact resistant glass set into an inswing operable frame and sash. The current windows are not operable.
- Rebuild the front entrance in a slightly different configuration. The two side doors would be removed and the main door brought forward to enlarge the width of the door to 3 feet for better egress. The previously existing side panels would be resized to 3 feet wide as well. Impact resistant glass will be used. This reconfiguration will allow a larger door and create a larger foyer space upon entering the building, which was previously very small.

The alterations were allowed with the intent of providing better protection for future flooding. However, the knee walls were not reinforced with concrete block, which was discovered after the 2018 flood, which was the impetus for the entire storefront renovation after the 2016 flood. The difference in the profile detailing from the previously existing storefront windows (prior to 2016) and the casement windows was not evident at time the alteration was approved in HPC-16-101. The casement windows have a very bulky profile and trim, whereas the previous windows were more historically appropriate with a narrow profile and trim. The storefront window arrangement prior to the 2016 flood was not historic, as the storefront has been altered over the years, but it was more compatible with the building than the current arrangement. The windows should be restored to the condition prior to the 2016 flood. The current windows are white, but if restored correctly, should be painted black to match the previously existing narrow frames and existing windows on the upper floors of the building. The casement windows do not comply with the Guidelines as the profile detailing was significantly different and detracts from the architectural integrity of the storefront, as shown in Figure 6 and 7 below. Restoration to pre-2016 flood conditions would better comply with Chapter 6.K of the Guidelines above, which recommends replacing detailing on storefronts that have been obscured by later additions.

Front Door

Chapter 6.G: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Entrances

- 4) *Chapter 6.G recommends, "when repair is not possible, replace historic doors and entrance features with features of the same size, style and finish."*

Chapter 5: Routine Maintenance

- 5) *Chapter 5 states the following is Routine Maintenance, "painting previously painted surfaces using the same color."*

The proposed full light wood door will match the previously existing door that was destroyed in the 2018 flood and complies with the Guideline recommendations. The new door will be painted to match the previously existing color and is considered Routine Maintenance.

Exterior Brick Walls

Chapter 6.C: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Masonry

- 6) Chapter 6.C recommends, "if a masonry wall or feature must be replaced, use material as similar to the original as possible, particularly if the materials are visible from a public road or are key elements of the building's style or character."
- 7) Chapter 6.C recommends, "use mortar mixes that are compatible with early stone and brick."

A spec of the proposed infill brick and mortar was not provided, but any infill should match the existing brick and mortar in type and color.

Awning

Chapter 4: The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

- 8) Standard 10 states, "New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

The awning is not historic and dates to approximately 2000. The awning extends into the public-right-of-way and partially hides the storefront cornice on the building façade. The removal of the awning complies with the Secretary of the Interior Standards and will not negatively affect the integrity of the historic building.

Entryway Tile Floor

Chapter 6.G: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Entrances

- 9) Chapter 6.G recommends, "when repair is not possible, replace historic doors and entrance features with features of the same size, style and finish."
- 10) Chapter 6.GH recommends against "unnecessarily replacing original doors and entrance features on historic buildings."

The tile floor is not historic; it was rebuilt in 2017 and was approved in case HPC-17-52. The floor is only being proposed to be temporarily removed and the tile work will be reconstructed in the future.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted, contingent upon:

- 1) The storefront windows being restored to a pre-2016 condition.
- 2) The tile floor entryway be rebuilt in the future.

Testimony: Mr. Shad asked if there was anyone in the audience that was in opposition to the application that would like to testify. There was no one in the audience who wanted to testify. Mr. Hollenbeck was previously sworn in. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Hollenbeck had any corrections or additions to the staff report. Mr. Hollenbeck stated he had two handouts in response to staff comments, the first was product data for alternate windows that DPW proposes to use and the second, is product data for the terra cotta repair mortar for the terra cotta façade.

Mr. Hollenbeck stated that in response to the staff comments, DPW looked into using an alternate window section. He explained that the existing windows are casement windows with a tilt function and the frame is 10 inches wide and quite bulky. He said DPW would install a fixed casement which would be direct set, without a brickmould, into the openings. Mr. Hollenbeck noted the basis for installing that type of window would allow DPW to use a laminated glazing, which is a manufactured product. This way DPW can also remove the window pane easily for future work on the building without having to take apart the storefront. Mr. Hollenbeck said that to make the window look correct, the trim work below the windows would need to be redone.

Mr. Hollenbeck explained the photos in his handout and said that he superimposed, in red, the visible light sizes for the windows that DPW is proposing. These measurements are the same width as the windows installed after the 1999 fire, however the height would be 4 inches less because the knee wall was rebuilt after the 2016 flood. Mr. Hollenbeck stated he is proposing to redo the trim on the lower inset panels with applied 1x2 and painted the trim the cream color similar to pre-2016 flood, to more closely resemble the proportions in the photo.

Mr. Hollenbeck stated the second handout provided included information on product data for terra cotta repair mortar, the façade is terra cotta as is some of the interior demising walls. Mr. Hollenbeck explained DPW would try to use a product compatible to mortar and the color would be selected from the manufacturers range to more closely match some previously repairs that were done with regular mortar. Mr. Hollenbeck stated he had tried to chip out the mortar and match more closely with the upcoming repairs to the building.

Mr. Reich stated that the building looks more like brick than terra cotta. Mr. Hollenbeck agreed. Ms. Tennor asked if the windows that are being proposed to be installed instead would resemble the windows prior to the first flood. Mr. Hollenbeck said the windows would more closely resemble the pre-flood windows.

Ms. Tennor asked for clarification on removing the tile flooring at the entrance of the building to put in a concrete slab. Mr. Hollenbeck explained that the front portion of the building that is parallel with Main Street has a floor that is wood framed with a one-inch concrete slab on top. Mr. Hollenbeck stated DPW is working to infill the basement with flowable fill so that there is not any sort of void space that would have the potential to rot out the underside of the floor. Mr. Hollenbeck explained that DPW needs to take out the whole wood structure, which is why the tile needs to be removed. Mr. Hollenbeck stated the current tile floor was installed after the 2016 flood and is adhered to the wood. He stated another large-scale construction project would be happening in the future at this location and the tile could be destroyed with that project, so he would prefer waiting until the renovation project was completed to handle the replacement of the tile floor. Ms. Tennor asked if the tile floor would go into storage. Mr. Hollenbeck said the tile was installed in 2016 after the first flood and is not historic tile.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve as submitted with the addition of two contingencies offered by the staff. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-19-29 – 8293 Main Street, Ellicott City

Certificate of Approval to install sign.

Applicant: Temrah Okonksi

Request: The applicant, Temrah Okonksi, President of the Ellicott City Rotary Club, requests a Certificate of Approval to install a sign.

Background and Site Description: This building is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890.

The existing Sunrise Rotary Club sign was approved in June 1994 to be 18x24 inches.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to install a double-sided projecting sign on the corner of the front façade of 8293 Main Street, attached to and under the existing Rotary Club sign or installed on a

new armature. The new sign will be identical in size and design but will not have the hours the group meets on the front as the Sunrise Rotary Club sign does. The sign will read: Ellicott City Rotary Club

Although the application form specifies the dimensions will 30 inches high by 18 inches wide, the Applicant has agreed to reduce the size of the sign to 24 inches high by 18 ^{1/8} inches wide to be the same dimensions as the existing sign (the applicant checked with the sign maker of the existing sign, who provided the dimensions of 24 x 18 ^{1/8}, which is a slight discrepancy from the 1994 approval).

The application does not specify the sign material. The applicant said that sign was going to be ½" thick exterior PVC by Komacel, but also agreed that it would be possible to use wood instead, to better comply with the Guidelines.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 11.A: Signs, General Guidelines

- 1) Chapter 11.A recommends, "Use simple legible words and graphics."
- 2) Chapter 11.A recommends, "Use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three."
- 3) Chapter 11.A recommends, "Use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware."

The sign will use simple legible words and read "Ellicott City Rotary Club." The sign will contain three colors: white, blue and yellow. The applicant agreed to amend the sign material to wood.

Chapter 11.B: Signs, Commercial Buildings

- 4) Chapter 11. B recommends, "If more than one sign is used to identify a building's tenants, use signs that are similar in scale, harmonious in style and color, and located symmetrically or uniformly on the building."

The sign will match the shape and design of the existing Sunrise Rotary Club sign, so it will be harmonious in style and color with the existing sign. Generally, the sign complies with this Guideline recommendation, but since it is not the Sunrise Ellicott City Rotary club, it may be more appropriate to remove the sun graphic from the proposed sign, as to not confuse the different Rotary clubs.

- 5) Chapter 11.B recommends, "Limit the sign area to be in scale with the building. Projecting or hanging signs of four to six square feet are appropriate for many of Ellicott City's small, attached commercial buildings."

The sign will be 3 square feet, which is slightly smaller than the recommended range. The size complies with the Guideline recommendations.

- 6) Chapter 11.B recommends against:
 - a. "Two signs where one is sufficient to provide an easily visible identification of the business."
 - b. "More than two signs per business per façade."
 - c. "More than one projecting sign per façade of a structure."

The proposed sign is not a business sign, but rather indicates that a group has a regular meeting at this location. The proposal to add a second projecting sign with a new armature does not comply with Guideline 6.C, which recommends no more than one projecting sign.

The proposal to add an additional sign of the exact same design under the existing sign also does not comply with Chapter 11.B recommendations.

The additional signs would result in excessive signage on the building as the business, Tersiguel's, already has established signs on the building.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC provide guidance on adding a second sign. For example, since the applicant proposes to replace the existing sign in shape and design, is there an opportunity to combine the information for both signs onto one sign?

Testimony: Mr. Reich recused himself from the proceedings for this application. Ms. Holmes stated that one Commission member had completed a suggested mock up for the sign. Mr. Shad asked if there was anyone in the audience opposed to the application that would want to testify. There was no one in the audience who wanted to testify. Mr. Shad swore in Temrah Okonski. Mr. Shad asked if Ms. Okonski had any comments about the staff report. Ms. Okonski stated she liked what the staff thought. Ms. Okonski stated she had not approached the Sunrise Club as she was not sure what the Commission would be thinking. Ms. Okonski explained that she liked the way the sign was drawn out with one hanging from the other. She explained that she wasn't sure what the next steps would be if the Sunrise Club didn't like the sign. The Commission, staff and the applicant discussed potential next steps with getting approval from the Sunrise Rotary Club.

Ms. Tennor explained that the Guidelines try to organize signs to fit together if there is more than one sign, and not have more than one armature. She explained that her design was an attempt to show how both clubs are meeting at one location. Ms. Okonski stated she liked the design. Ms. Zoren asked what the dimensions of the lower portion of the sign were. Ms. Tennor said the design was intended to be 18 inches wide like the existing sign, so it was possibly 6 inches tall. Ms. Okonski asked if the sign panels for Ellicott City Rotary and Sunrise Rotary would be 6 inches tall. Ms. Tennor said it might be a little taller, as she hadn't designed the exact dimensions. Ms. Okonski said she could give the sign company a total length and stated the signage company told her they could comply with anything the Commission wanted. Ms. Tennor stated there were probably some constraints from the Rotary International about displaying the logos and names, but the mock up seemed like a reasonable way to display both clubs. Ms. Okonski stated that Rotary International documented signage on their website with specifics regarding colors and fonts.

The Commission and the applicant discussed verbiage on the Ellicott City Rotary Club sign panel regarding adding a meeting time or the website url. Ms. Tennor stated she was not sure if it would fit within the constraints of the limit of words but suggested that the Ellicott City Rotary Club's website be an alternative to their hours.

Mr. Shad asked the Applicant was okay with staff recommendation that wood be used as the material for the sign. Ms. Okonski said the signage company could comply with the recommendations given on the sign. Mr. Shad asked if the signs would be double sided. Ms. Okonski confirmed the signs would be double sided. The Commission discussed the potential size of the sign. Mr. Taylor clarified that the Applicant was applying for a new sign to replace the existing sign. Mr. Taylor said that it sounded like the Commission had a consensus to approve the sign at no more than a total of 4-6 square feet and would allow the hours, or an alternative with the website address. Mr. Roth stated that is what he was trying to offer as a discussion.

Motion: Ms. Zoren made the following motion: In light of staff recommendations, the Commission will not approve a new hanging bracket for the sign, the applicant will re-use the same existing bracket on

the building. The Commission would approve Exhibit A, a three-part sign. The top part of the sign showing the rotary logo, the second part showing limited text saying Sunrise Rotary Club, etc, and the third tier would say Ellicott City Rotary Club, with either their selected dates or website reference. The sign will be double-sided and made out of wood. The size limitation will be no greater than 4 square feet, 18 inches of width to match the existing sign, to fit on the existing bracket. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-19-30 – 8141 Main Street, Ellicott City

Certificate of Approval to install sign.

Applicant: Joseph Iacia

Request: The applicant, Joseph Iacia, requests a Certificate of Approval to install two signs on the building at 8141 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. The building is not historic, and according to SDAT dates to 1987. The building was constructed after the previous historic building was destroyed in a fire.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to install two signs on the front façade of the building. Both signs would be made out of 6mm ACM panel (aluminum composite panels) with a black background and plotter cut white vinyl letters. Both signs would have a black and white border around the perimeter of the sign.

The first sign would be a double-sided projecting sign. The sign would be 1 foot 8 inches high by 2 feet 9 inches wide, for a total of 4.8 square feet. The sign would be hung on the existing bracket. The sign would read on two lines:

Vintage
Chic

The second sign would be flat mounted on the front façade of the building, in the existing brown sign panel area. The flat mounted sign would be 1 foot 8 inches high by 10 feet 10 inches wide, for a total of 18 square feet. The sign would read "Vintage Chic" on one line.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 11.A: Signs, General Guidelines

1) Chapter 11.A recommends:

- a. "use simple, legible words and graphics."*
- b. "keep letters to a minimum and the message brief and to the point."*
- c. "use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade."*

The signs comply with recommendations A-C above as the signs will contain the name of the store in a readable script and will contain two colors, black and white.

2) Chapter 11.A recommends:

- a. "use historically appropriate material such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware."*

The signs do not comply with recommendation 2.A, as the material will be aluminum composite panels with vinyl lettering.

Chapter 11.B: Signs, Commercial Buildings

3) Chapter 11.B recommends against:

- a. *"two signs where one is sufficient to provide an easily visible identification of the business."*

The proposal to install two signs on the front of the building does not comply with the Guideline recommendation.

- 4) Chapter 11.B recommends, *"incorporate the sign into the facade of the building. Sign should fit within the lines and panels of the façade as defined by the building frame and architectural details."*

The flat mounted sign is located in the panel above the storefront. However, the sign does not fit into the panel, as the background of the sign contains a significant amount of dead space, as does the panel on the building.

- 5) Chapter 11.B recommends, *"in most cases, limit the areas of signage to one-half square foot of sign area for each linear foot of primary street frontage, with a limit of eight square feet in area for any one sign. More sign area is appropriate for some of Ellicott City's larger buildings, where these limits would result in signs that are ineffective or not in scale with the building."*

The flat mounted sign is proposed to be a total of 18 square feet, which exceeds the size recommended by the Guidelines. The building is not large enough to warrant a larger sign.

- 6) Chapter 11.B recommends, *"limit the sign area to be in scale with the building. Projecting or hanging signs of four to six square feet are appropriate for many of Ellicott City's small, attached commercial buildings."*

The projecting sign will be 4.8 square feet, which complies with the Guideline recommendation.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the design of the projecting sign, in a material that complies with the Design Guidelines.

Testimony: Mr. Shad asked if there was anyone in the audience who was in opposition to the application that would like to testify. There was no one in the audience that wanted to testify. Mr. Shad swore in Joseph Iacia and Celeste Gebler. Mr. Shad asked if the applicants had any comments or clarifications on the staff report. Mr. Iacia stated they had no comments and that he understood what the Commission is looking for in terms of signage. Ms. Gebler said she is fine with using the one hanging sign. Ms. Tennor asked the applicants if they had a problem using a wood panel instead of aluminum for the sign materials. Mr. Iacia asked if the sign would need to be painted on top of the wood. Ms. Tennor stated the signage could be vinyl placed on the wood, and it would add a bit of dimension to the sign.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted; limited to the one hanging sign made of wood. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-19-31 – 3877 College Avenue, Ellicott City

Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Michael Smith

Request: The applicant, Michael Smith, requests a Certificate of Approval and Tax Credit Pre-Approval to make exterior repairs and alterations.

Background and Site Description: The property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1937.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to replace the slate roof in-kind, with new slate and make repairs to the chimney. The roof replacement will include the following work:

- 1) Remove all existing, original slate and flashing from house.
- 2) Install 36" PSU 30 ice and water shield throughout eaves, valleys and penetrations.
- 3) Repair replace any damaged sub-roofing.
- 4) Install titanium synthetic roofing underlayment.
- 5) Fabricate C-4, 5-inch drip edge with 16 oz. copper and install along roof perimeter.
- 6) Install 16x random Vermont Gray/black slates with 7.5-inch exposure.
- 7) Fabricate and install new 16 oz. copper flashing. Seal all flashing.
- 8) Install copper ridge cap and 2-inch bronze snow guards.

The repairs to the chimney will include:

- 9) Repoint deteriorated mortar joints/cracks as needed, using a similar color mortar.
- 10) Install new concrete chimney crown.
- 11) Apply waterproof coating to entire brick chimney.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 6.C: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Masonry

1) Chapter 6.C recommends:

- a. *"Maintain or restore original brick, stone, concrete block or stucco. Make repairs with materials that match the original as closely as possible."*
- b. *"Use mortar mixes that are compatible with early stone and brick."*

The application does not specify the type of mortar mix, other than it will be a similar color to the existing. The mortar should match the existing in color and type, so that it does not stand out as having been repointed and to avoid damage to the historic brick. Otherwise, the proposal to repair deterioration mortar complies with the Guideline recommendations. This work is eligible for tax credits, per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

2) Chapter 6.C recommends against:

- a. *"Applying water-resistant or water-proof coatings to the exterior of masonry. This may cause water to be trapped in the masonry and damage the material."*
- b. *"Changing the width of mortar joints in a masonry wall or repointing using incompatible mortar."*

The proposal to apply waterproof coating to the brick chimney does not comply with the Guideline recommendations, which specifically recommends against such coatings, as they can trap existing water in the brick and mortar, causing damage.

Chapter 6.E: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Roofs, Dormers and Gutters

- 3) Chapter 6.E recommends, "replace historic roof materials only when necessary due to extensive deterioration; use replacement material that matches or is similar to the original."

The proposed replacement slate will match the original as closely as possible and complies with the Guideline recommendations. The in-kind replacement of the slate roof and associated work (Items 1-8) are eligible for tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve Items 1-10 and recommends the HPC pre-approve tax credits for Items 1-10. Staff recommends the HPC not approve Item 11, the waterproofing, which does not comply with the Guidelines.

Testimony: Mr. Shad asked if anyone in the audience who was in opposition to the application that wanted to testify. There was no one in the audience who wanted to testify. Mr. Shad swore in Michael Smith. Mr. Shad asked if he had any corrections or additions to the staff report. Mr. Smith stated he had no comments, but in respect to item 11, the flood proofing of the chimney, he had obtained a gortex sealant that wicks water away and is unlike silicone materials. He said the gortex sealant would not retain water, that it would shed water and the seal would last for 11 years.

Ms. Tennor asked how the materials would be reversed, if one wanted to remove it after it was placed and for clarification if over an 11-year time period the material would degrade. Mr. Smith stated that the gortex sealant preforms its waterproof function and one would not want to remove it. The gortex sealant would need to be replaced after 11 years to continue to waterproof the chimney. Mr. Smith stated the crown of the chimney has deteriorated and he would like to do something to corrective, the mortar will match as closely as he can to the color that is currently there. Mr. Smith would like to enhance the longevity of the chimney and apply this material that would assist in the effort.

Mr. Reich asked if the material was clear and would soak into the brick. Mr. Smith stated the gortex sealant was not a coloring and it would not discolor the brick. Mr. Smith explained that the product would absorb in the brick.

Mr. Reich asked if it could be part of the tax credit approval as the gortex sealant will be put on the chimney to help preserve the structure. Ms. Zoren stated that staff's initial objection to the waterproofing coating was due to the typically waterproofing is opaque coloring that would obscure the brick. She said that if this gortex sealant is clear, the Commission would be willing to look at it. Mr. Smith stated he could present the product information to the staff.

Ms. Holmes clarified the language in the Guidelines that recommend against waterproof coatings because it can damage the masonry materials. Mr. Smith said that he would avoid any material that would accelerate deterioration of the brick.

Ms. Tennor stated that the photo Mr. Smith provided indicates the new slate is much thinner than the existing slate on the house. Mr. Smith stated the new slate will be the same thickness. He said that slate deteriorates over time. He explained that the house was built in 1936 and said the current roof is 80 years old and needs to be replaced.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted, including the sealant in Item 11, all the items with tax credit pre-approval, with the understanding that the sealant is a clear sealant and

does not affect the appearance of the brick. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-19-32 – 8289 Main Street, Ellicott City

Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations.

Applicant: The Fund for Art in Ellicott City

Request: The applicant, The Fund for Art in Ellicott City, Inc., requests a Certificate of Approval to paint a mural on the side of the building at 8289 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1920. According to SDAT the building dates to 1924. According to Joetta Cramm's book, *Historic Ellicott City*, the building was used as the Ellicott City Garage, a Ford agency. The building was altered in the 1970s/80s and restored in 2016.

The exposed brick wall on the east side of the building, where the mural is proposed, was historically not a visible wall. Prior to the construction of the neighboring Post Office, there was a historic building adjoining the subject building. The building was torn down for the construction of the Post Office, which left the wall of the subject building visible.

The Commission provided Advisory Comments on the proposed murals in September 2018 and March 2019. In March 2019 the Commission noted that the brick on the side of the building was in poor condition, so it would be acceptable to paint directly onto the brick in that area.

Scope of Work: The applicant seeks approval to paint the two murals on the side of the building. The main mural will show the interior showroom floor of the Ford Dealership. The second mural, to be located to left of the main mural, will show a mechanic working on a car. The application explains that the only changes from the March 2019 Advisory application is that the mural has been extended down to the sidewalk and the pedestrians reflect more diversity.

The primary mural will show the inside of the Ford Dealership, depicting vintage model cars. The mural will use muted paint colors and will include:

- 1) Various shades of Venetian Red will be used to create the appearance of bricks.
- 2) Oyster Beige will be the color of the Model T car.
- 3) Different shades of pale gray will be used to create the appearance of the tin ceiling.
- 4) Upsdell Red will be used for the other model car.
- 5) Seaweed Green will be used on the jacket of a pedestrian.
- 6) Hazelwood Beige will be used to create the appearance of the interior floor.
- 7) Additionally, a few blues, browns, grays, black and white will be used.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 11.B: Signs, Commercial Buildings

- 1) *Chapter 11.B states, "Painting a sign directly on a wall of other structural part of a building is not permitted by the County Sign Code. However, the Board of Appeals may grant a variance for such signs if they are found to contribute significantly to the historical, architectural or aesthetic character of the area. A wall mural that does not advertise a business or identify an area is not a sign and is not regulated by the Sign Code. Well-executed artwork such as wall mural can make a*

positive contribution to the historic district. Any wall mural, whether or not it is a sign, requires approval by the Historic Preservation Commission."

The Guidelines do not contain any other recommendations specific to murals. The proposed mural does meet the qualifications to be considered a mural rather than a sign as it will not be advertising a business. The mural also directly relates to the history of the building, which was originally a Ford dealership.

Chapter 6.C: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Masonry

- 2) *Chapter 6.C recommends against, "painting historic stone or historic brick that has never been painted or removing paint from masonry walls that were originally painted."*

The proposed mural will be painted directly onto brick that has never been painted. However, as explained above, historically this wall was not visible because it adjoined a neighboring building and as a result, the brick to be painted is in poor condition. The current context of the building has been changed from its original configuration in that the side is now visible. The Guideline prescribing painting unpainted brick was intended to maintain the character of exposed brick and does not apply in this instance because this brick was never meant to be exposed.

Section 16.607. - Standards for Review

- (a) *Elements for Consideration.* In reviewing an application for a certificate of approval, the Commission shall give consideration to:
- (1) *The historic, architectural, or archeological value or significance of the structure and its relationship to historic value of the surrounding area.*
 - (2) *The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure to the remainder of the structure and to the surrounding area.*
 - (3) *The general compatibility of exterior design, scale, proportion, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used.*
 - (4) *Any other factors, including aesthetic factors, which the Commission deems to be pertinent.*

The above section of code, Section 16.607, provides guidance for the Commission to use in its review of the mural given that the Guidelines do not otherwise provide recommendations specific to murals. The mural will be in scale with the building and will be located on the side of the building that was not historically visible. The mural will not detract from the integrity of the restored front façade.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommend the HPC approve the mural as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Shad asked if anyone in the audience was in opposition to the application or that wished to testify. Lisa Wingate stated she would like to ask a question. Mr. Shad swore in Kimberly Egan from the Fund of Art in Ellicott City and Antonia Ramis Miguel, the artist for the mural. Mr. Shad asked the applicants if they had any corrections or additions to the staff report. Ms. Egan stated that she and Ms. Miguel wanted to discuss with the Commission the preparation of the brick wall for the paint, as the wall is in poor condition with lumps of masonry coming out. Ms. Egan explained that in order for Ms. Miguel to paint the wall there would need to be some kind of smoothing out of the surface before the project begins. Ms. Egan stated the wall will be primed before paint is put on the brick but wanted to get the Commission's suggestions on how to smooth out the brick wall.

Mr. Reich stated that the brick wall would need to be parged to give the wall a flat appearance. He said the parging could be attached to the masonry, if the masonry is clean. Mr. Reich recommended adding a scratch coat, a base coat, and a finish coat or a 3-coat stucco process in order to give that smooth look

on the wall. He said this process would not destroy the historic brick and if anyone wanted to remove the mural in the future, the stucco could be peeled off and the original brick would still be there. Ms. Miguel stated that there are some parts of the wall that have cement protruding out. Mr. Reich said the applicants would need to chip the cement off, and the removal of the cement would not affect the historic nature of the wall. He said the original wall was covered as there was another building connected to the it, so the wall was covered up. Ms. Egan stated the area with the second part of the mural where the mechanic will be located was not obscured by another building wall and she wanted to make sure the Commission was okay with the applicants parging the wall. Mr. Reich stated that in the previous meetings that the Commission had with the applicants, the Commission identified this wall as being a good place for a mural.

Ms. Egan stated the only changes that were made to the mural since the previous meeting the mural had received Advisory Comments, was that Ms. Miguel made the pedestrians a little more diverse and the pedestrians were lowered down closer to the sidewalk since they received a comment about having the pedestrians reaching closer to the sidewalk.

Ms. Tennor asked about the process of applying parging to the wall to create a smooth surface and then creating the illusion of an irregular void, when one is viewing the mural. Ms. Tennor stated that this process would need to be carefully done so that Ms. Miguel does not end up with a hard edge that fights against the illusion she is trying to create at the periphery of the image. Ms. Miguel said she would be painting it to appear as if the wall is broken through. Ms. Egan asked for clarification of Ms. Tennor's concern of the image appearing 3-dimensional if the periphery is also jagged. Mr. Reich stated the concern would be the edge of the parging is going to make it look obvious that there is a separation between the painting and the original wall. Ms. Miguel stated that the orientation of the brick will be the same as the actual mural. Ms. Miguel said at the top of the wall, the main part of the mural she will be painting will be 20' wide by 10' high, and the corner of the wall that has a triangle at the top will not be part of the mural, but she would like to paint the brick so that it appears that is part of the actual wall, in order to restore the look of it.

Ms. Tennor asked if the pedestrian figures are going to be appearing in front of the conduit that is attached to the wall. Ms. Tennor asked how Ms. Miguel will be achieving the look. Ms. Miguel stated that the people will be painted over the conduit and will be life size to appear that they are actually standing at the mural. Mr. Reich asked what the life expectancy of the painting will be. Ms. Miguel stated the life expectancy will be years, the wall will be primed, the paint selected is very durable to weather, and the mural will be sealed. Ms. Egan stated the Fund for Art in Ellicott City could always have Ms. Miguel come back to touch up the wall.

Ms. Holmes asked about the specifications to what the parging materials should consist of so that the parging does not trap water behind the wall and cause further damage to the brick. Mr. Reich stated parging itself is porous, so it will breath. Ms. Holmes stated she wanted to ensure the applicants would not use a Portland cement. Mr. Reich stated the applicants could use a fiber stucco mix. Ms. Miguel asked if she could use mortar. Mr. Reich stated that it is almost exactly like mortar and discussed different suppliers that could help Ms. Egan and Ms. Miguel obtain the correct materials they would need for parging.

Mr. Shad stated that there was an audience member that would like to ask questions. Mr. Shad swore in Lisa Wingate. Ms. Wingate asked how the applicants would be fixing the rugged masonry wall. Mr. Shad responded the applicant would be fixing the wall with parging. Ms. Wingate asked about the floor of the showroom being depicted hip high on the larger than life man, she wanted to know if the floor could be

lowered to resemble the actual height of the building floor. Ms. Miguel stated it could be lowered to have it be the same height as the actual store. Ms. Wingate had no further questions.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted with the specifications of paring to be submitted to staff, for approval by staff. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

HPC-19-33 – 8249 Main Street, Ellicott City

Certificate of Approval to install mural.

Applicant: The Fund for Art in Ellicott City, Inc.

Request: The applicant, the Fund for Art in Ellicott City, Inc., requests a Certificate of Approval to install six mural panels on the side of the building at 8249 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1920.

The Commission provided Advisory Comments on the proposed murals in September 2018 and March 2019. At the March 2019 meeting, the Commissioners expressed concern about having a mural on the side of this building. The Commission commented that they liked the proposal for the aerial map, but there was not agreement on an appropriate size and scale. The Commission also expressed their support for having elements of the National Road mural depicted on the building.

Scope of Work: The applicant seeks approval to paint the mural showing the aerial view of the historic district with the Sanborn maps and a brick or cobble (it is unclear which) sidewalk underneath. The mural will be painted on brushed aluminum panels, which will then be installed on the brick exterior walls of the building. The small squares running horizontally across the mural will be enclosed plastic boxes to hold business cards for the shops.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 11.B: Signs, Commercial Buildings

- 1) *Chapter 11.B states, "Painting a sign directly on a wall of other structural part of a building is not permitted by the County Sign Code. However, the Board of Appeals may grant a variance for such signs if they are found to contribute significantly to the historical, architectural or aesthetic character of the area. A wall mural that does not advertise a business or identify an area is not a sign and is not regulated by the Sign Code. Well-executed artwork such as wall mural can make a positive contribution to the historic district. Any wall mural, whether or not it is a sign, requires approval by the Historic Preservation Commission."*

The proposed mural will act as a sign if it contains the business card holder, as it will be advertising businesses. If the mural is to be reviewed as a sign, there are stricter guidelines in place that regulate color and size.

Chapter 6.C: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Masonry

- 2) *Chapter 6.C recommends against, "painting historic stone or historic brick that has never been painted or removing paint from masonry walls that were originally painted."*

The side of this building has always been exposed and did not adjoin another building. The mural will not be painted directly on the brick of the building, which has never been painted. The mural will be painted on an aluminum panel and mounted to the building.

Chapter 11: Signs

- 3) *Chapter 11 recommends, "on masonry walls, drill into the mortar joints rather than into the stone or brick to attach fasteners for the brackets supporting the sign."*

Although the mural is not intended to be a sign, this recommendation applies. The application does not currently address the installation method and what will be required to secure the panels safely to the building. The mural should be securely fastened into the mortar, rather than the brick because once removed, it is significantly easier to repointing the mortar, versus replacing damaged bricks to match the historic brick.

Chapter 4: The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

- 4) *Standard 10 states, "New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."*

Because the mural will only be adhered to the building with panels, once it is removed and the mortar repointed, the integrity of the building will be unimpaired.

Section 16.607. - Standards for Review

- (a) *Elements for Consideration.* In reviewing an application for a certificate of approval, the Commission shall give consideration to:
- (1) *The historic, architectural, or archeological value or significance of the structure and its relationship to historic value of the surrounding area.*
 - (2) *The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure to the remainder of the structure and to the surrounding area.*
 - (3) *The general compatibility of exterior design, scale, proportion, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used.*
 - (4) *Any other factors, including aesthetic factors, which the Commission deems to be pertinent.*

The above section of code, Section 16.607, provides guidance for the Commission to use in its review of the mural given that the Guidelines do not otherwise provide recommendations specific to murals. The mural does not seem to be in scale with the building.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the mural without the business card holders. If the business card holders are to remain, they should be evaluated consistent with the Sign Guidelines and regulations.

Testimony: Ms. Egan was already sworn in. Mr. Shad asked if there was anyone in the audience who was opposed to the application that would like to testify. There was no one in the audience that wanted to testify. Mr. Shad asked if Ms. Egan had any comments on the staff report. Ms. Egan explained that the cobblestones are a replication of the Tiber Alley cobblestones. She said the cobblestones were included in the mural rendering because at the Advisory Comment meeting, the Fund for Art in Ellicott City received a comment about how the mural would look if it extended down closer to the sidewalk. Ms. Egan said that the proposed rendering addresses that issue carrying the cobblestone down to the ground. Ms. Egan said that the artist was flexible with using this image (Figure 14) or the original

submitted image. She said the building owner has given the artist free reign to paint whichever image the Commission approved.

Ms. Egan stated that regarding the business cards, the artist, Wiley Purkey, thought of the concept not for signage, but as wayfinding to supplement the map. She said the business cards would show the viewer where they would need to go and how they could get there. Ms. Egan said the slots on the mural would hold the business cards and allow the business cards to be swapped out as businesses change. She understood if the Commission viewed the business cards as signage.

Mr. Roth asked who would be putting the business cards into the slots on the mural and who would be deciding which business cards would be put into the slots. Ms. Egan stated the Fund for the Art in Ellicott City would be placing the cards in the slots, and she said the hope is to have a business card for each business that they could get. Ms. Egan said they would only leave out businesses that did not want to be included in the mural. Mr. Roth asked if the slots would be used as business card dispensers and if those viewing the mural could take business cards. Ms. Egan said it would not be a dispenser and explained the slots would be permanently enclosed so the business cards would not get wet. Mr. Roth stated if the business cards were permanent it could be seen as a sign. Ms. Egan stated that the slots could be updated as needed.

Ms. Holmes asked if Ms. Egan had specifications for the business card holder. Ms. Egan said she would need to get that information from Mr. Purkey, as he had a clear vision for the kind of plastic he would use to keep the cards visible and dry, that would keep the plastic from getting cloudy.

Ms. Tennor asked for details of how the mural panels would be affixed to the exterior building wall. Ms. Egan stated the staff comments suggested to bolt the panels to the mortar and not to the brick, which the Fund for the Art in Ellicott City would follow. Ms. Tennor asked about space between the panels and the wall, and asked if the applicant knew how much space would be there. Ms. Egan stated there would not be much space as she did not want the panels to interfere with pedestrians and to ensure that nothing could collect behind the panels. Ms. Tennor asked for details of how the panels would attach to the wall and how the applicant planned to avoid having space behind the panel. Ms. Egan and Ms. Tennor discussed building a reveal around the mural so that debris and water would not collect behind the mural and damage the brick. Ms. Egan stated that could be done easily.

Ms. Egan noted that there were currently two banners that were mounted to the brick instead of the mortar on the side of the building where the mural was going to be bolted. She stated the owner did not like these banners and that the Fund for Art in Ellicott City would be happy to remove the banners while installing the mural. Ms. Holmes stated the banners had not been approved. Mr. Taylor clarified that Ms. Egan did not need permission to remove them.

The Commission and staff discussed whether the business card holder was considered a mural or whether it turned the mural into a sign, and if the application should be evaluated against the sign guidelines. If the mural was reviewed as a sign, the Commission would apply different criteria to it than a mural. Mr. Roth asked Ms. Egan if she had received or would be receiving any form of compensation from the businesses whose cards would be going on the mural. Ms. Egan stated that she had not received any form of compensation, and stated she is not being paid to market any of the businesses.

Ms. Tennor stated that she felt the business cards were a part of the mural, in the way that a business may be part of a collage. She said that while there is information that can be used to locate a business, the business cards are an artifact of the mural and not a sign. Mr. Reich stated the previous mural incorporated the Ford logo. Ms. Egan stated that she and Mr. Purkey view the business cards as being

supplemental to the map, and as part of the map. Mr. Reich stated there were 42 spaces for the cards, and he hopes there are 42 businesses to put cards in the slots. Mr. Egan stated that the Fund for Art in Ellicott City will put as many retailers as there are in the mural. Ms. Zoren asked if the artist was concerned about the business cards being a mishmash of different font size and color that could detract from his nice muted painting. Ms. Egan stated that artist was not concerned as the cards were no bigger than a business card. Mr. Roth stated that the differences in color of the cards would only come into play if the Commission was trying to apply sign regulations to the application. Mr. Roth said that the Commission should determine this application was not a sign and was a mural. Mr. Reich and Ms. Tennor agreed with Mr. Roth.

Mr. Reich stated he did not understand the portion of the mural that contained the cobblestone. Ms. Egan explained that the cobblestones were added to the mural due to comments at the previous meeting, asking how the mural would look if it spanned further down the wall to the sidewalk. Ms. Egan said the proposal submitted was the result of those comments. She explained that the cobblestone was a representation of Tiber Alley but said the mural could also look like the previous submission and just contain the map and schematics. Mr. Reich said the cobblestone did not add anything to the mural and it conflicted with the brick sidewalk, and he would prefer the just the map on the mural. Ms. Zoren agreed that she preferred the shortened version without the cobblestone, which kept more focus on the map and the artwork. Ms. Zoren stated she was concerned if the mural spanned too far down the wall that people may kick the mural and it would be more prone to damage the closer it is to the ground. Ms. Egan said they could paint the version without the cobblestone, but make the painting bigger and have the street portion of the mural be around eye level of the person viewing the mural. Mr. Reich asked if the mural the map would continue down without the cobblestone. Ms. Egan said the applicant would expand the whole mural to be larger, but that it would still be proportional and keep the same relational dimensions.

Mr. Taylor said the Advisory Comments from that meeting were incorporated into the record by reference. Ms. Tennor located a copy of the previous version of the mural submitted back at the March 2019 meeting. Ms. Zoren, Mr. Roth and Mr. Reich stated they preferred the March 2019 version of the mural. Mr. Roth added that the cobblestone from Tiber Alley created chaos with the existing brick sidewalk. Mr. Taylor asked if Ms. Egan was willing to amend the application to the mural that was previously submitted. Ms. Egan confirmed.

Mr. Shad asked if returning to the March 2019 version of the mural would mean that the mural would be doubling the number of the business cards. Ms. Egan stated Mr. Purkey had not counted the number of business cards on that version of the mural, he was trying to represent his vision with that version. Ms. Egan stated that they may receive many business cards which could potentially cause the need of an additional row, but she would be willing to come back before the Commission to request additional rows if needed. Ms. Egan stated the Fund for Art in Ellicott City did not want to be in a position of excluding businesses from the mural.

Mr. Shad said he was concerned with adding another row to the mural and opposed to the whole business card idea, but felt that a second row would be going overboard. Mr. Reich stated that there are probably about 100 businesses in Ellicott City, so one line of 42 business card slots would not be enough if everyone wanted to be included. Ms. Tennor stated she felt the version of the mural brought tonight, without the cobblestone, contained a grid where the business cards are located, which the previous version did not have. She said the grid was more organized. Mr. Reich said the business card aspect looked like a railroad track. Mr. Reich suggest the Commission approve one line for the business card holders, and the applicants can return if they want to have a second row approved.

Mr. Taylor said the Commission would be approving the version of the mural before them tonight with the cobblestone. Mr. Reich stated the Commission was approving the version without the cobblestones, the original submission. Mr. Taylor was asking for clarification that the Commission was approving the image with the location of the business cards and not an image with the random placement of the business cards. Ms. Tennor agreed. Mr. Roth stated the Commission was approving the image where the business cards run along Frederick Road, the Sandborn map of Ellicott City, and no cobblestone, as opposed to the image where the business cards run along the side of the railroad track. Ms. Egan stated she understood.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve the design as submitted, with the removal of the cobblestones, so that the bottom of the panels will be raised to the point comparable to the original submission. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was approved 4 to 1, Mr. Shad opposed.

HPC-19-34 – Sidewalks, curbs and gutter in the vicinity of 8267 Main Street to 8411 Main Street to 3880 Ellicott Mills Drive

Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations

Applicant: Howard County Department of Public Works

Request: The applicant, John Seefried from the Howard County Department of Public Works, requests a Certificate of Approval to replace flood damaged sidewalks and cast-in-place curb and gutter in the vicinity of 8267 Main Street to 8411 Main Street, to 3880 Ellicott Mills Drive.

Background and Site Description: The proposed locations for sidewalk and cast-in-place curb and gutter installation are in the Ellicott City Historic District. There are a variety of historic buildings fronting the sidewalks.

The application explains that after the July 30, 2016 and May 27, 2018 floods, the County replaced damaged sections of sidewalk with asphalt as a temporary measure until a longer-term rebuilding strategy could be identified as part of a master planning process. The applicant received Advisory Comments from the Commission for the sidewalk replacements in May 2019. The Commission made the following recommendations and suggestions:

- Install brick sidewalks to comply with the Guidelines and maintain historic feel.
- Set the bricks in concrete to assist with stability.
- Use granite curbs.
- Smaller concrete scoring patterns would be advantageous for access to utilities.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to replace the flood damaged sidewalks with concrete in the following two patterns:

- 1) Single Lateral scoring with the following options:
 - i. With a 12 to 18-inch new concrete joint against the building front in the locations that are currently paved in asphalt.
 - ii. With a 12 to 18-inch existing concrete joint against the building front in the locations that are currently paved in concrete.
 - iii. Without a joint for the narrower sidewalks.
- 2) London Paver scoring

The applicant also proposes to replace the curb and gutters with a new cast-in-place curb and gutter, where needed. The concrete sidewalks and curb and gutter will be tinted to avoid a bright white appearance and are proposed to match the color used in the sidewalks on Court Avenue, and will

contain: concrete admixtures and surface treatments, carbon black, liquid, 2 to 8 pounds per bag of cement.

Regarding the proposed sidewalks, the application states:

“The two scoring patterns will include a “London Paver” pattern for unique focus areas such as in front of the Welcome Center and along the [proposed] open channel on lower Main Street, and a simple lateral score line for most of the street (as currently exists in several areas).

At the Visitor Center (8267 Main Street) location, the application contains drawings with two possible options. The applicant’s preferred option is to use a London Paver scoring pattern in front of the Welcome Center, but shows an alternate option using the single score line if uniformity with the Main Street sidewalks is desired.

The single lateral scoring pattern and its various options will be used in different areas, depending on the existing conditions (width of sidewalk and existing material), as shown on the map in Figure 15 below. In areas where the sidewalks are currently concrete, a 12 to 18-inch band of existing concrete will remain at the building face, with a joint between the new and existing concrete. The application explains that this will minimize disturbance adjacent to the building and allow for future repairs without having to impact the pavement immediately adjacent to the building. For areas of sidewalk installation that are currently asphalt, a new concrete joint is proposed at 12 to 18-inches from the building façade to allow for the clean replacement of a panel in the future for maintenance work without creating an impact to the pavement immediately adjacent to the building. Both scenarios will contain the same 12 to 18-inch joint to match.

Regarding the proposed use of cast-in-place curb and gutter, the application states:

“The concrete curb and gutter is a continuous pour with more integral strength to protect the sidewalk from being undercut by flood waters that could dislodge granite curb segments. A granite curb (where it adjoins the adjacent asphalt) is less scour resistant.

The application contains the following explanation regarding the Master Plan process and explanation stating why concrete is proposed as the replacement material:

“The master planning team, including two water resource firms (RK&K and Land Studies) closely coordinated with McCormick Taylor who developed the 2D flood models and the Hydraulic and Hydrology Study for the County. Through modeling, the master planning team and McCormick Taylor determined that a continuous pour material, such as concrete, is a more flood resilient material than unit pavers, such as brick, particularly when factoring in the high velocities of the flood waters and the associated shear stress created.”

The application explains that the modeling showed that many locations were not suitable for brick based on the shear stress that was modeled. The master planning team explored using brick in some areas and concrete in others, but recommended against this approach, which would have resulted in a less unified streetscape. The application explains that the planning team also concluded that until significant flood mitigation measures that reduce shear stresses can be put in place, concrete paving is the appropriate and responsible choice when considering resiliency. The application notes that the “shear stress map and paver suitability map was based on the 100-year storm (over 24 hours), but the flash floods experienced in 2016 and 2018 were more intense over a shorter duration (July 2016 was 6.6 inches in 3.55 hours – equivalent probability exceeds the NOAA Atlas 1,000-year event for Ellicott City).

The application explains that the May 2018 storm had brick pavers damaged in areas where the 100-year shear stress map had indicated pavers could work. For example, the brick pavers in front of Tersiguel's were shown as an appropriate location based on the 100-year shear stress map, but the pavers were damaged in the flood and did not remain in place. The application contains photos of lower Main Street sidewalks, which are concrete with a single lateral score. These sidewalks are located in a high stress area and were not destroyed in the two floods.

The application also explains that the proposed concrete sidewalks can make flood proofing more effective for adjacent buildings based on the Army Corps of Engineers *Nonstructural Flood Study for Ellicott City, MD*. The application contains photos that show the brick pavers contributed to debris that clogged the storm drains in the 2016 and 2018 floods. The application contains photos from the 2016 and 2018 floods showing examples of how the brick sidewalks scoured out and were destroyed, but concrete sidewalks remained intact.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 9.D: Landscape and Site Elements; Walls, Fences, Terraces, Walkways and Driveways

- 1) *Chapter 9.D states, "The most appropriate design and materials for new walls, driveways and other features depends on the specific context. As a rule, they should be simple in design and require minimal changes to the existing topography and natural features. Simple designs will be consistent with historic Ellicott City structures and help new elements to blend with their context...Whenever possible, the materials used should be those used historically in the particular area of the district, especially for features that will be readily visible from a public way."*

The concrete sidewalks are proposed for the specific context of flood resiliency. The proposed sidewalks will be simple in design. As shown in the historic photos in Addendum A, concrete sidewalks have been used historically along Main Street.

Chapter 10.A: Parking Lots, Public Streets and Street Furniture; Paving Materials and Street Design

- 2) *Chapter 10.A states, "A variety of paving materials can be used as alternatives to asphalt or concrete. The brick sidewalks and crosswalks used along portions of Main Street blend well with the mix of historic building materials. Granite pavers or stone walks would be in keeping with the early Ellicott's Mills period of the historic district's growth. During the later Ellicott City growth period (mid to late 19th century) granite curbs with asphalt block and London Walk pavers would have been used. Use of materials such as these for plazas, parking areas, driveways or walkways will help to provide an appropriate public environment for the historic district."*
- 3) *Chapter 10.A states, "The concrete sidewalks along Main Street should continue to be replaced with brick when possible. The uniform use of brick for these sidewalks will help to create an identifiable, attractive historic commercial area."*
- 4) *Chapter 10.A recommends, "When opportunities arise, replace concrete sidewalks with brick along Main Street between Ellicott Mills Drive and the Patapsco River."*
- 5) *Chapter 10.A recommends, "For plazas, driveways, parking lots, walkways and other paved areas, use stone or stone-like materials as alternatives to asphalt or concrete where practical."*

While the proposed scored concrete sidewalks do not comply with the Guideline recommendations to replace the sidewalks with brick, the existing adopted design guidelines do not anticipate flood resilient materials and scenarios or account for high velocity floods and the corresponding shear stress on the infrastructure.

The proposed concrete sidewalks would comply with the goal of Chapter 10.A in that it would involve the uniform use of one material and would “create an identifiable, attractive historic commercial area.” Some of the areas to be replaced are existing concrete sidewalks, which would be an in-kind replacement. By extending the use of concrete to other areas, it will help to maintain uniformity and a cohesive streetscape.

A review of historic photos shows that a variety of sidewalk materials have existed, such as brick (just barely visible) and concrete. These photos can be seen in Addendum A.

Chapter 10.C Parking Lots, Public Streets and Street Furniture, Street Furniture

- 6) *Chapter 10.C recommends, “Improve consistency in design throughout the historic district for items such as street lights, traffic signals, public signage, trash receptacles, and other street furniture.”*

The recommendation for Chapter 10.C is not directly related to sidewalks, but emphasizes consistency in design, similar to the Guideline for Chapter 10.A which recommends “uniform use” of a material (albeit it recommends brick, which was the movement at the time the current guidelines were written). The previously existing sidewalks consisted of both brick and concrete and was not a consistent design throughout Main Street. The previously existing brick sidewalks were also a modern brick, and not an appropriate historic color.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC determine if the proposal meets the intent of the Guidelines and make an approval based on that determination.

Testimony: Mr. Shad asked if there was anyone in opposition to the application that would like to testify. There was no one in the audience who was in opposition or wanted to testify. Mr. Shad swore in Shaina Hernandez, Senior Policy Advisory for the County Executive; John Seefried the Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Engineering (Department of Public Works); and Tom McGilloway, with Mahan Rykiel Associates.

Ms. Hernandez said the Administration is committed to acting quickly to restore function to Ellicott City’s infrastructure, while being sensitive to the Historic District. Ms. Hernandez said the Administration would prefer a comprehensive solution for the sidewalks, rather than a piece-meal one addressing only the in-kind replacement. She explained that the Administration has received several complaints about the asphalt becoming a tripping hazard. Ms. Hernandez stated the plan being presented to the Commission was supported by the County Executive, as it is an effective solution that will be a very visible improvement from the asphalt patches and will create even surfaces and remove the numerous trip hazards. She said that it is seen as the best solution for future construction where excavation is needed.

Mr. McGilloway explained that the project area included Hamilton Street, Main Street between Hamilton Street and Ellicott Mills Drive and the spur of Ellicott Mills Drive that was impacted by the culvert improvement. Mr. McGilloway explained they received feedback from community meetings through the master planning process related to ADA accessibility and the need for smooth surfaces on sidewalks.

Mr. McGilloway provided an overview of the existing conditions of the sidewalks in the project area. He explained the sidewalks contain a variety of materials and that some areas of brick remained intact after the flood, and that several areas consisted of temporary asphalt paving. The PowerPoint slides showed examples of these various materials, just north of the Welcome Center there is existing concrete panels

left intact, and then areas to the south where asphalt has been used as a temporary treatment. Mr. McGilloway showed areas near the Wine Bin where brick was left largely intact and then further down from the Wine Bin where there is a combination of brick, concrete and asphalt.

Mr. McGilloway showed slides with historic photos of Ellicott City, the first few photos showed evidence of brick sidewalks along lower Main Street. Mr. McGilloway said the emergence of concrete sidewalks in Main Street appeared around the 1940s. Mr. McGilloway explained the proposal is to utilize concrete paving for sidewalks as it has demonstrated resiliency and was already a precedent in several areas along Main Street in the Historic District and in other historic communities. Mr. McGilloway explained the approach is to incorporate a single lateral score line in most places, and then a London paver scoring pattern in special focus areas. Mr. McGilloway referenced McCormick Taylor's 2D Hydraulic and Hydrologic (H&H) flood modeling of Ellicott City that was used during the early process of the master planning. Mr. McGilloway made a correction to a slide that was labeled incorrectly, which should have read "concrete recommended" for areas where the shear stresses was shown as greater than 5psf. Mr. McGilloway stated the engineers from McCormick Taylor recommended that in areas that are greater than 5psf concrete was recommended and in areas less than 5psf brick pavers would be okay. Mr. McGilloway explained that an area identified in front of Tersiguels acceptable for brick pavers based on the shear stress had the pavers torn up in the 2018 flood. He said that due to the unpredictability of storms, Mahan Rykiel is no longer recommending brick pavers be used.

Mr. Roth asked if the Master Plan team was making assumptions as to whether the other aspects of the storm water mitigation work has been done or if this information is based on the state of the watershed in 2016. Mr. McGilloway stated it was based on the state of the watershed in 2016 and today, as the flood mitigation strategies that are going to make a major impact are not going to be in place for five years. Mr. Roth asked if concrete was being proposed as a permanent solution or as a placeholder until five years, when it could become something else. Mr. McGilloway stated that they would recommend the concrete be permanent for as long as it lasts and said the durability or lifespan is probably 20 years or so for the concrete and the next time the sidewalks would need to be replaced, the idea could be revisited then. Mr. McGilloway stated he did not think it would be prudent to recommend the sidewalks come in as concrete now and then replace them again in five years.

Mr. McGilloway said that flood modeling and shear stress tests were done prior to the presentation of the non-structural flood proofing study for Ellicott City completed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. McGilloway explained that the Army Corps emphasized that considerations also needed to be made not just for the buildings, but for stabilizing sidewalks and outside features to reduce flood risk damages to buildings and utilities. McGilloway said that Army Corps explained that brick and pavers get torn up in the fast-moving floodwaters and can expose what is underneath the sidewalks and the materials have the potential to cause more damage downstream. Mr. McGilloway showed photographs in front of Tersiguels and the Welcome Center taken after the 2018 flood depicting the bricks torn up and infrastructure washed out. Mr. McGilloway showed photographs where utilities were exposed due to the flood damage and photographs that showed brick had washed downstream and were clogging inlets.

Mr. McGilloway then showed photographs of the west end of Main Street where concrete withstood the floodwaters from 2018. Mr. McGilloway stated the Ellicott City Design Guidelines, specifically Chapters 9 and 10, were not written to anticipate the need for flood resiliency. He said that Chapter 9 explains that materials should be simple in design. Mr. McGilloway referred to the simple design informing the Master Plan team of the scoring pattern they selected. Mr. McGilloway said the simple designs are consistent with Historic Ellicott City structures that help elements blend with the context.

Mr. McGilloway said the proposal shows replacing concrete and brick when possible with concrete to provide for uniform use throughout Main Street.

Mr. McGilloway explained the Master Plan team recommends tinting the sidewalks, like those by the Court House, to avoid the bright white appearance. Ms. Tennor asked if there were granite curbs next to the sidewalk by the Courthouse. Mr. McGilloway confirmed that was correct.

Mr. McGilloway stated that other historic communities like Quebec City and Baltimore use simple score lines that are both narrow and wide on their sidewalks.

Mr. McGilloway described the project areas based on the map (Figure 15) that was submitted as part of the application and explained which pattern would be in each location. Mr. McGilloway explained that Area A, in front of the Welcome Center, is where the London paver scoring pattern was recommended. He said the London paver scoring would be 2x3 feet panels that are staggered. Area D is for narrow sidewalks, but also where sidewalks are not immediately adjacent to a building. He said that Area B is where there is existing concrete in place that is in good condition and Mr. McGilloway recommends keeping it 12-18 inch band of the existing concrete adjacent to the building so the rest of the sidewalk can be replaced with new concrete. Area C represents areas where there is currently asphalt or brick paving that extends to the building face, and the entire sidewalk would be replaced with concrete. In these locations it is recommended to have a joint in at the 12 to 18 inch band from the new building, so there is a natural joint when utilities need to be replaced and to prevent tearing up concrete right adjacent to the building.

Mr. McGilloway addressed the previous months Advisory Comments recommending the brick paving that is mortared in place over a concrete base. Mr. McGilloway stated that Master Plan team does not recommend this strategy due to ADA accessibility, having expansion joints extend up through the bricks that could disrupt the pattern of the paving surface and the difficulty of repairing utilities with patch and repair.

Mr. Seefried showed photographs of a brick mortared in place over a concrete bed sidewalk behind the Wine Bin. He explained that the sidewalk held up during the 2018 storm, but needed to be cut through for the removal of the failed culvert behind the Wine Bin. Mr. Seefried explained that there was separation between the brick mortar bed and the concrete when the sidewalk was cut into for access. Mr. Seefried explained that this would be the challenge of using this type of sidewalk for when utilities need to be maintained in the future. Mr. Reich stated the reason for the separation was due to the workmanship that caused the concrete to be undermined, not the brick improperly bonding to the concrete. The Commission and Mr. Seefried further discussed the damage to concrete.

Mr. McGilloway said the use of brick sidewalks is a trend that has gone away with streetscape paving, as there is more attention to ADA, as brick creates a less comfortable surface to walk on with the indentation of mortar joints. Mr. Reich said that with mortared flush joints it can make the indentation of the mortar minimal.

Mr. Reich asked if Mr. McGilloway had a composite of all the paving materials in Ellicott City. Mr. Seefried said he had an inventory of the materials prior to the floods.

The applicants discussed ADA accessibility and freeze thaw issues that can occur with the brick mortared in place sidewalks with the Commission.

Mr. Reich said he would like to shortcut the discussion to a decision based on aesthetics and what Ellicott City wants, because he does not believe that brick is not as durable as concrete when expansion joints will be in both the concrete and the brick.

Ms. Tennor said the other aspect would be the curbing as well, and whether it should be continuous pour curb and gutter versus granite curbing. Ms. Tennor stated she did not have an inventory on the amount of granite curbs in the study area, but the continuous pour curb and gutter is not historical. Mr. Reich explained that concrete curbs are seen as more durable because they are continuous, however there will be control joints in the concrete curbs every 10 or 15 feet. Mr. McGilloway explained that the continuous pour curb and gutter does not have a scour point at the joint where the granite curb will because the granite is set vertically. Ms. Tennor stated she believed most of the granite curbs were on the side streets off of Main Street. Mr. Reich asked the applicants if the granite curbs on Court Avenue stayed in place, despite all the floodwater that came down the street. Mr. Seefried said that they had not looked into that information.

Mr. Reich restated that he did not think it would be possible for the Commission to make a decision on the sidewalks at the meeting, as it would be setting a precedent for all of Ellicott City. Mr. Shad agreed, since the applicants said that all the sidewalks with brick were going to be replaced with concrete.

Mr. Seefried said that while the Commission framed the discussion in terms of aesthetic and cost, his perspective on the topic is that it is a safety issue for erosion and he wants to put back a surface that does not erode. He stated that it is in his professional opinion that the concrete sidewalk is in the best interest of the public. He explained that it stays in place for its erosive capacity, meaning that the concrete will drop and stay in place and not cause further damage downstream as debris like the bricks have done after the floods. Mr. Seefried provided an explanation of how the brick and concrete sidewalks act during and after a flood situation and showed photograph examples.

Mr. Shad stated that the bricks that went downstream were not placed in a bed of concrete and mortar but laid in sand beds. Mr. Shad asked how the idea of bedding brick in concrete and mortar was different than the end result that Mr. Seefried presented. Mr. Reich stated that the example was a bad example of workmanship and the concrete was undermined.

Mr. McGilloway explained that the historic photographs of Ellicott City brick sidewalks did not have the visible mortared joints, which is a contemporary application for brick which would need to be weighed into consideration. Mr. Reich agreed with Mr. McGilloway. Mr. Seefried asked his question about the brick bedding again. Mr. Reich stated that they would need to have the application similarly to what was done at the Wine Bin with expansion joints every 15 to 20 feet. Mr. Reich stated if the whole thing was undermined it was going to cause some failure, but it would not wash away downstream. Mr. Reich stated that regarding the cost of maintenance and the ease of putting in utilities, concrete is preferable; but aesthetically the brick is preferable.

Mr. Roth asked if it were typical to have such a thick layer of mortar under the brick sidewalk that Mr. Seefried shared as an example. Mr. Reich and Ms. Zoren stated it was not typical. Mr. Reich said that there was an inordinate amount of force put on the slab of sidewalk being used in the example Mr. Seefried showed. Mr. Roth and Mr. Reich discussed how the mortared brick sidewalk example was a poor one as the sidewalk was not put together properly and the excavation was done incorrectly. Ms. Zoren added this example was not damaged by the floodwaters.

Mr. Seefried stated this was his opinion of the results of brick mortared sidewalk when excavations need to be done for utility work and that is why he showed the picture. Mr. Reich and Mr. Seefried discussed the placement of utilities under the sidewalk and the freeze thaw issues.

Mr. Seefried stated he did not feel the Commission was amendable to the proposal and he would like to withdraw the application. Mr. Reich said the Commission needed more time to consider the application and walk Main Street to look at the current conditions of the sidewalk.

Ms. Tennor asked about the possibility of tinting the continuous pour gutter and curb to match the sidewalk, so it did not have a stark white appearance. Mr. McGilloway stated that it was possible to tint the curb and gutter.

Mr. Seefried stated again that he would like to withdraw the application and continue with temporary measures of repairing the sidewalks until the Commission's Guidelines have changed or the Master Plan has been approved. Mr. Roth asked for clarity on the temporary measures materials continuing to be asphalt. Mr. Seefried stated it was not his decision.

Mr. Reich said he would like to continue the case until the following month to give the Commission time to review everything the County has submitted. Mr. Shad stated he was amendable to replacing concrete sidewalk in-kind where sidewalk is needed, but the areas where the brick would be taken out and replaced with concrete he was opposed to.

Mr. Roth stated the Guidelines state to replace with brick. Mr. Taylor explained that the Guidelines say more than that and referenced that granite curbs with asphalt block and London walk pavers would have been used. Mr. Taylor said the Guidelines also state certain types of street improvements, particularly those related to public safety take priority of retaining historic characteristics, however the relationship of the historic buildings to the adjacent public street should be preserved to the extent possible when street improvements are designed. Ms. Tennor stated she would endorse the 12 to 18 inch variable band width in front of the buildings to maintain that continuous line off of the foundation, but was not sure of the rest.

Mr. Reich asked if the Guidelines address the issue of continuity. Ms. Holmes stated the Guidelines mention uniform use of materials, such as street furniture should be uniform. She explained the reference is not necessarily relating to sidewalks, but was applicable to the uniform use of materials. Mr. Taylor stated the Guidelines generally prefer some consistency as opposed to a patch work. Mr. McGilloway stated the Guidelines mention keeping the materials simple.

Mr. Seefried stated the applicants would like to withdraw the application. Ms. Holmes asked if the Commission would receive public comment. Mr. Taylor stated for the record, he was not sure if the application would come back next month, but it would be helpful to have an inventory of how much granite curb and gutter was on Main Street versus the side streets. He said it would be helpful to understand where granite curb is going to be removed, and there needs to be some specificity in what is being removed and what is being replaced.

Mr. Reich asked if the plan has gone to the point of having a construction drawing. Mr. McGilloway said that has not occurred. Mr. Reich asked if there was a study that shows a scaled drawing of all the paving along Main Street. Mr. McGilloway stated there was a survey done on Main Street, but it does not identify the materials that have changed due to the result of the flood.


Mr. Reich stated he did not want to throw out the whole proposal, but wanted more time to consider the information and have a chance to walk around Main Street. Mr. Reich stated he did not have enough information tonight to make a decision. Ms. Holmes stated Mr. Reich could continue the case if he wanted. Ms. Tennor and Mr. Roth also agreed they would prefer to continue the case to next month. Ms. Holmes stated the Commission wanted some supplementary information, such as the location of existing granite curbs, would there be existing granite curb removed in the vicinity. Mr. Roth and Ms. Tennor expressed the importance of ADA compliance.

Mr. Shad asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to share public comment. Mr. Shad swore in Wiley Purkey. Mr. Purkey stated he was originally a resident of Fels Lane and has seen over the years Ellicott City lose more and more of its historic character with the removal of the street car tracks, the cobblestone and granite curbing disappear. Mr. Purkey stated the granite curb contributes to the historic ambiance of Ellicott City. Mr. Purkey stated he wanted the Commission to preserve what they could.

Mr. Taylor asked the Commission if they have continued the case to next month. Ms. Tennor confirmed the case will continue to next month.

Motion: There was no motion, the case has been continued to the July 11, 2019.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.



Allan Shad, Chair



Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary



Samantha Holmes, Preservation Planner



Kaitlyn Clifford, Recording Secretary